Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## MAILED FEB 11 2011

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS** 

CLARK & ELBING LLP 101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON MA 02110

In re Application of

Gardella et al.

Application Number: 10/564,744

Filing Date: 03/03/2006 Attorney Docket Number:

00786/540002

: DECISION ON APPLICATION

: FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT

This letter is in response to the "REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT," filed on October 8, 2010, which is treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.705(b). Applicants request that the initial determination of patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. § 154(b) be increased by 104 days from 259 days to 363 days.

The application for patent term adjustment is GRANTED to the extent indicated.

The Office has updated the PALM and PAIR screens to reflect that the revised Patent Term Adjustment determination at the time of the mailing of the Notice of Allowance is three hundred fortynine (349) days. A copy of the updated PAIR screen, showing the revised determination, is enclosed.

On July 13, 2010, the Office mailed the Determination of Patent Term Adjustment under 35 U.S.C. §154(b) in the above-identified application. The Notice stated that the patent term adjustment to date is 259 days (451 days of Office delay reduced by 192 days of applicant delay). The subject application for patent term adjustment was timely filed on October 8, 2010.1

PALM records show that the Issue Fee was received on October 8, 2010.

Applicants dispute the reductions of 14 and 92 days, respectively, for the filing of supplemental responses, (in this case, Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs)) on July 20, 2009, 14 days after the filing of a reply on July 6, 2009, and on June 22, 2010, 92 days after the filing of a reply on March 24, 2010.

Applicants assert that the IDSs are accompanied by the statement in accordance with 37 CFR 1.704(d) and, therefore, should not be considered failures to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude processing or examination. Further, the present petition is accompanied by a statement under 37 CFR 1.704(d).

## 37 CFR 1.704(c)(8) states:

Circumstances that constitute a failure of the applicant to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude processing or examination of an application also include the following circumstances, which will result in the following reduction of the period of adjustment set forth in § 1.703 to the extent that the periods are not overlapping: Submission of a supplemental reply or other paper, other than a supplemental reply or other paper expressly requested by the examiner, after a reply has been filed, in which case the period of adjustment set forth in § 1.703 shall be reduced by the number of days, if any, beginning on the day after the date the initial reply was filed and ending on the date that the supplemental reply or other such paper was filed.

## 37 CFR 1.704(d) states:

A paper containing only an information disclosure statement in compliance with §§ 1.97 and 1.98 will not be considered a failure to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution (processing or examination) of the application under paragraphs (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9), or (c)(10) of this section if it is accompanied by a statement that each item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was first cited in any communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart application and that this communication was not received by any individual designated in § 1.56(c) more than thirty days prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement. This thirty-day period is not extendable.

A review of the record reveals that on July 20, 2009, an IDS was filed, 14 days after the day after the date a reply was filed, July 6, 2009, in response to an Office action. The IDS was not accompanied by the statement set forth at 37 CFR 1.704(d).

Applicants' argument that the 14 day period of reduction for applicant delay should be removed is unavailing. It is undisputed that the IDS was not accompanied by the statement set forth under § 1.704(d). Further, there is no provision in the rules for the Office to accept a statement under § 1.704(d) which did not accompany (i.e., was not filed contemporaneously with) the IDS. Accordingly, the reduction of 14 days is proper and will not be removed.

With regard to the supplemental IDS filed on June 22, 2010, a review of the record reveals that a statement in accordance with § 1.704(d) has been provided in the transmittal letter accompanying the IDS. Accordingly, the period of reduction of 92 days is not warranted and will be removed.

Applicants further disclose that a period of two (2) days of reduction for applicant delay should be entered for the filing of a supplemental response on March 24, 2010, two (2) days after the filing of a reply on March 22, 2010.

Upon review, applicants' argument is well taken. On March 22, 2010, a reply to an Office action was filed. On March 24, 2010, a supplemental reply in the form of an IDS was filed, two (2) days after a reply was filed. The IDS was not accompanied by the statement set forth in § 1.704(d). Accordingly a two (2) day reduction for applicant delay is warranted pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704(c)(8).

In view thereof, the determination of PTA at the time of the mailing of the Notice of Allowance is updated to 349 days (451 days of PTO delay, reduced by 102 days (61 + 14 + 25 + 2) days of Applicant delay).

The Office thanks applicants for their good faith and candor in bringing this to the attention of the Office.

The Office acknowledges submission of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.18(e). No additional fees are required.

The application is being forwarded to the Office of Data Management for issuance of a patent. The patent term adjustment

indicated on the patent (as shown on the Issue Notification mailed about three weeks prior to patent issuance) will include any additional adjustment accrued both for Office delay in issuing the patent more than four months after payment of the issue fee and satisfaction of all outstanding requirements, and for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent (to the extent that the three-year period does not overlap with periods already accorded).

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3231.

Douglas I. Wood

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions

Encl: Revised PAIR Calculation

10/564,744 CONFORMATIONALLY CONSTRAINED PARTHYROID HORMONE (PTH) ANALOGS			) ANALOGS	02-09- 2011::14:31:32		
Patent Te	rm Adjustm	ents				
Patent Term	Adjustment (P	TA) for Application N	umber: 10/564,744			
Filing or 371	(c) Date:	03-03-2006	Overlapping Days Between {A and B} or	{A and C}:		(
ssue Date of Patent: -		-	Non-Overlapping USPTO Delays:			45
A Delays:		451	PTO Manual Adjustments:			90
B Delays:		0	Applicant Delays:			19
C Delays:		0	Total PTA Adjustments:			349
Patent Tern	n Adjustment	History	<b>Explanation Of Calculations</b>			
Number	Date	Contents Descripti	on	PTO(Days)	APPL (Days)	Star
9	02-09-2011	Adjustment of PTA C	Calculation by PTO		2	
98	02-09-2011	Adjustment of PTA C	Calculation by PTO	92		
72	07-13-2010	Mail Notice of Allowance				
71	07-06-2010	Issue Revision Completed				
70	07-06-2010	Document Verification				
59	07-06-2010	Notice of Allowance	Data Verification Completed			
8	07-06-2010	Examiner's Amendm	ent Communication			
57	07-06-2010	Notice of Allowability	,			
53	06-22-2010	Information Disclosu	re Statement considered			
52	03-24-2010	Information Disclosu	ire Statement considered			
51	06-22-2010	Information Disclosu	re Statement (IDS) Filed		92	9
50	06-22-2010	Information Disclosu	re Statement (IDS) Filed			
59		Reference capture or	·			
58		·	ire Statement (IDS) Filed			
57		Date Forwarded to E	• • •			
56		Response after Non-	Final Action		25	9
55	03-22-2010					
54		·	re Statement (IDS) Filed			
53		Electronic Review				
52		Email Notification	•			
51		Mail Non-Final Rejec	tion	19		4
50	•	Non-Final Rejection		1,7		
19		•	re Statement considered			
18			ire Statement considered			
17			re Statement (IDS) Filed		14	4
16		Reference capture of	•		14	
15		•	re Statement (IDS) Filed			
14		Date Forwarded to E	• • •			
<del>13</del>		Response after Non-			61	
					01	;
12	07-06-2009	•				
¥1			ire Statement (IDS) Filed			
10			re Statement (IDS) Filed			
38	02-06-2009	Electronic Review				
37 26	02-06-2009		*ion	40		
36 >=	02-06-2009	•	LIOH	13		
35	02-02-2009	•	um Chahamanh agasidasad			
34			re Statement considered			
33	10-29-2008					
32		Response to Election				
31	09-24-2008	Request for Extension	on or time - Granted			
29	08-15-2008	Mail Post Card				

28	08-07-2008	Email Notification		0
27	07-21-2008	Mail Supplemental Restriction / Election Requirement		0
26	07-17-2008	Supplemental Restriction		0
25	06-26-2008	Electronic Review		0
24	06-25-2008	Email Notification		0
23	06-25-2008	Mail Restriction Requirement	419	9
22	06-23-2008	Requirement for Restriction / Election		0
20	04-15-2008	Email Notification		0
19	04-15-2008	Change in Power of Attorney (May Include Associate POA)		0
18	04-09-2008	Correspondence Address Change		0
17 .	11-29-2007	Reference capture on IDS		0
16	11-29-2007	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed		0
15	11-29-2007	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed	•	0
14	11-06-2007	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU		0
13	10-29-2007	IFW TSS Processing by Tech Center Complete		0
11	08-30-2007	PG-Pub Issue Notification		0
10	06-05-2007	Application Dispatched from OIPE		0
9	03-03-2006	371 Completion Date		0
8	05-17-2007	Sent to Classification Contractor		0
7	05-17-2007	Notice of DO/EO Acceptance Mailed		0
6	10-31-2006	CRF Is Good Technically / Entered into Database		0
5	04-20-2006	Preliminary Amendment		0

**Close Window**